



Milind Diwan <milind.diwan@gmail.com>

Check again

8 messages

Milind Diwan <diwan@bnl.gov>**Mon, Feb 18, 2008 at 4:07 PM**

Reply-To: diwan@bnl.gov

To: Kenneth Lande <klande@physics.upenn.edu>, Laurie Littenberg <litt@bnl.gov>, Kevin Lesko <ktlesko@lbl.gov>, Mark Dierckxsens <mdier@hep.uchicago.edu>, Mary Bishai <mbishai@bnl.gov>, Steve Kettell <kettell@bnl.gov>

Please check my talk for inaccuracies.

It has been scrubbed twice now. Should be O.K.

--

regards,
Milind Diwan, Ph.D.



SLAC-p5-meeting.pdf
1642K

Mary Bishai <mbishai@bnl.gov>**Mon, Feb 18, 2008 at 5:33 PM**

To: Milind Diwan <diwan@bnl.gov>

Hi Milind,

Why are you using the old 28 GeV disappearance plot for your cover page?
The WBLE disappearance plots are available at

http://www.phy.bnl.gov/~bishai/nwg/work/rates/plots/png/h_wble120_disap_1300_0.png
http://www.phy.bnl.gov/~bishai/nwg/work/rates/plots/png/h_wble060_disap_1300_0.png

These are just rates using total CC of course. Or do you want the actual
QE cross-sections?

You can do an exposure of 0.5 MT and 2E7 seconds (1yr) and add a $\times 10^3$
on the plot to get the rates you want.

=====

Mary Bishai	Office: 3-181
Associate Physicist	Pager:
Brookhaven National Laboratory	Tel: 631-344-4877
Bldg 510E, P.O. Box 5000	FAX: 631-344-4741
Upton, NY 11973-5000	E-mail: mbishai@bnl.gov

=====

[Quoted text hidden]

Mary Bishai <mbishai@bnl.gov>**Mon, Feb 18, 2008 at 5:49 PM**To: Milind Diwan <diwan@bnl.gov>Cc: Kenneth Lande <klande@physics.upenn.edu>, Laurie Littenberg <litt@bnl.gov>, Kevin Lesko <ktlesko@lbl.gov>, Mark Dierckxsens <mdier@hep.uchicago.edu>, Mary Bishai <mbishai@bnl.gov>, Steve Kettell <kettell@bnl.gov>

Somewhere on your slides you should again emphasize that the CPV asymmetry is inversely proportional to θ_{13} => always need big detector. Perhaps on pg5 with the bubble plots?

-pg 6: I am pretty sure we used $2.5\text{E-}3\text{ eV}^2$ not 2.7(Mark?). Also shouldn't this exposure be 120 e20 POT? Its 2MW.

-Pg 9 : Something aint scaling: From page 6 we get 800 events/(2MW. 300kT, 3 yrs) -> expect 160events/(1.2MW, 100kT, 3 yrs). Why is it 210?

-Pg 11: Is it really θ_{13} at 3sigma but mass hierarchy at 2 sigma? You should make that difference clearer.

=====

Mary Bishai	Office: 3-181
Associate Physicist	Pager:
Brookhaven National Laboratory	Tel: 631-344-4877
Bldg 510E, P.O. Box 5000	FAX: 631-344-4741
Upton, NY 11973-5000	E-mail: mbishai@bnl.gov

=====

On Mon, 18 Feb 2008, Milind Diwan wrote:

[Quoted text hidden]

Kevin Lesko <ktlesko@lbl.gov>**Mon, Feb 18, 2008 at 6:42 PM**To: Diwan Milind <diwan@bnl.gov>Cc: Kevin Lesko <ktlesko@lbl.gov>, Kenneth Lande <klande@physics.upenn.edu>, Laurie Littenberg <litt@bnl.gov>, Mark Dierckxsens <mdier@hep.uchicago.edu>, Mary Bishai <mbishai@bnl.gov>, Steve Kettell <kettell@bnl.gov>

Milind,
you should have in your backup slides a comparison of NOvA to 100kt WCh.

slide 4: CW - perhaps we should be careful in the language, spell things out, don't want the committee to spend time wondering, say it for them.

slide 6: polarity - same comment, you've got space say neutrinos and antineutrinos
move "2" next to the "MW"

slide 8: SuperNova --> Supernovae

slide 9: polarity thing again
move "2" next to the "MW"

slide 10: Reach with 100kt **Water Cherenkov**

slide 11: These are linear plots of slide 10, right? but at 2 sigma. ok, these are the nova comparisons, how about having an overlay with NOvA ready, just in case.

slide 15: units missing on electronics 10.65M

slide 16: ok, the only thing I found that was missing was rock disposal - could just be a conveyer to the open cut, but is ~ \$9M.

slide 18: could be ready in mid decade (2015) for **physics**
 unique physics capability in the world.
 get started on much larger facility (->program) for CP violation.
 subsequent (rather than later caverns) cavities
 spell out scintillator,

Kevin

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]

Milind Diwan, Ph.D.<SLAC-p5-meeting.pdf>

Kevin T. Lesko KTLesko@lbl.gov
 Institute for Nuclear and Particle Astrophysics Tel: (510) 486-7731
 Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory FAX: (510) 486-6738
 1 Cyclotron Road, MS 50R5008 <http://ktlesko.lbl.gov>
 Berkeley, CA 94720-8158, USA

Mark Dierckxsens <mdier@hep.uchicago.edu>

Mon, Feb 18, 2008 at 7:03 PM

To: Mary Bishai <mbishai@bnl.gov>

Cc: Milind Diwan <diwan@bnl.gov>, Kenneth Lande <klande@physics.upenn.edu>, Laurie Littenberg <litt@bnl.gov>, Kevin Lesko <ktlesko@lbl.gov>, Steve Kettell <kettell@bnl.gov>

> -pg 6: I am pretty sure we used $2.5E-3 \text{ eV}^2$ not 2.7(Mark?).

We used $2.7e-3 \text{ eV}^2$ as agreed upon for the FNAL-BNL study (read: as was dictated by the goddess of fermilab).

> Also shouldnt

> this exposure be 120 e20 POT? Its 2MW.

>

These are the spectra using a 120 GeV beam. I'll make the 120e20 pot plots for the 60 GeV beam. They'll be on the website in ~30 mins (i.e. 19:30 EST).

> -Pg 9 : Something aint scaling: From page 6 we get 800 events/(2MW. 300kT,

> 3 yrs) -> expect 160events/(1.2MW, 100kT, 3 yrs). Why is it 210?

>

>

Related to previous point. The signal event rates for the 60 GeV beam are higher than the 120 GeV 0.5 degrees off axis beam for the same beam power, but the S/\sqrt{B} is roughly the same.

Mark

[Quoted text hidden]

Kevin Lesko <KTLesko@lbl.gov>

Mon, Feb 18, 2008 at 7:30 PM

To: Kevin Lesko <KTLesko@lbl.gov>

Cc: Diwan Milind <diwan@bnl.gov>, Kenneth Lande <klande@physics.upenn.edu>, Laurie Littenberg <litt@bnl.gov>, Mark Dierckxsens <mdier@hep.uchicago.edu>, Mary Bishai <mbishai@bnl.gov>, Steve Kettell <kettell@bnl.gov>

btw,
nice talk!
KTL

[Quoted text hidden]

Littenberg <litt@bnl.gov>

Tue, Feb 19, 2008 at 9:33 AM

To: Milind Diwan <diwan@bnl.gov>

Milind,

There are a lot of things that need to be fixed in this presentation. Let's get together ASAP.

Regards,
Laur

On Mon, 18 Feb 2008, Milind Diwan wrote:

[Quoted text hidden]

Littenberg <litt@bnl.gov>

Tue, Feb 19, 2008 at 5:52 PM

To: Milind Diwan <diwan@bnl.gov>

Milind,

I didn't realize you wouldn't be in today. I'll try to put as much as I can in email and be as clear as possible.

I think there are some real problems with your slides although the basic story is very good. I showed the talk to Howard and he agreed, and some of the specific comments below are his. The problems are mostly in presentation and I hope you can fix them in time.

One category is inconsistency of numbers and it is pretty bad. On page 1 you claim to be showing a graph for a 300KT detector with 1MW of beam. Before discussing whether the numbers and graphs are consistent or correct, I have to ask why you pick this case which doesn't correspond to any of the others discussed in the talk?

Then there are the numbers. You claim 100,000 CC events/year but the plot you give doesn't appear to support this. It's not immediately

obvious because the plot doesn't correspond to the case (it's a 500 KT detector rather than 300 KT). The plot claims it is for $5e7$ sec - how many years is that supposed to be? If I take $2e7$ sec/year, which I guess is conceivable for Fermilab, and scale to your case with $300KT \cdot 2e7s / (500KT \cdot 5e7s)$, I get a factor 0.24. The plot claims a total of 51,500 events for no oscillations. Therefore one year for a 300KT detector would give 12,360 events, about a factor 8 less than you claim! Did you slip a 0?

Later you show two sets of signal plots that are supposed to be for the ultimate and intermediate cases. According to your slides the two cases have the same beam power (2 MW) but differ by a factor 3 in detector mass, so the numbers of events should be different by a factor 3. Yet the corresponding numbers of signal events are different by factors between 4 and 5. Your audience is very likely to pick up on this! If you are too sloppy about numbers, the audience are liable to use this to calibrate you. Another point - the exposure here is given in PoT. If I take this to be for 3 years, it gives $2 \cdot 10^{21}$ /year. If I take a cycle time of 1.4sec and 170TP/cycle, this gives about $1.65e7$ seconds per year. This would make the disagreement of the first slide and plot a little worse! You should get command of all these numbers. I just remember when Stan Wojcicki utterly savaged the KOPIO TDR for inconsistencies that were far less serious.

Finally on the intermediate slide simulated signal slide there's a "Total rate of events $\sim 30k/yr$ ". This is inconsistent with what you have on the first page either the 100,000 (which would imply 67,000) or my corrected 12,000 (which would imply 8,000 for this case).

Also there's a bad font which gives your number 1's the appearance of capital I's.

Other points

1. The collaboration list on page 2 is out of date (Mary's not on it, etc.)
2. Second bullet of the Scientific strategy slide - what does "CW" mean? Also you should be sure to say a few words about the matter effect - not everyone on the Panel is an expert. Finally, wouldn't it be better to say "An experimental set up with a large matter effect, such as one gets with a 1300km baseline, is more sensitive to possible new physics."
3. The Technical Issue slide should have the word "DUSEL" somewhere on it. Also is the second bullet referring to NOvA? You may want to be explicit about this. Also you may want to have a conclusion bullet pointing out what a great result these plots imply. However I'm worried again about numerical consistency - the plots on this page refer to $120+120 \cdot 10^{20}$ PoT, twice as much as on the following page which refers to 3 years. This implies 6 years each for neutrino and anti-neutrino running. Do you really want to advertize this?
4. On the following slide (which should be labeled "Ultimate Reach"), your last bullet is "[background] Should be better with higher PMT count". Can you quantify this?
5. The Intermediate proposal slide at the end of the first bullet, you

should say what the previous experiments give confidence of - is it that a 100 IKT detector can be built? how well it will work? or ?

6. On the second bullit you end with "FNAL beam appears feasible" What is the point? Would anyone doubt Fermilab could build such a beam?

7. Your Megaton Modular ... slide will take a while to get through if you actually want them to understand it. There should be scales on it to indicate the size.

8. On your schedule slide the Site setup line starts this year. Is this being paid for by South Dakota? If not, how? It seems very aggressive.

9. For the cost slides, Howard claims Baltay wants all numbers in FY08 dollars. Do they need to be converted? Also, it's a little odd to separate out the one-time costs the way you have. Perhaps you should make a 2 or 3-row table at the top of the first cost slide entitled "one-time costs". Then put your present table underneath it and title it "Incremental cost for each 100KT detector". Then the table on the second cost slide would be 2 or 3 rows shorter.

10. Note that your backup cost slide is not obviously consistent with the tables in the previous cost slides. You have \$33.3M for the total chamber cost - how does that square with the \$28.1M? Etc. It may be better not to give them the backup. If you do, you should explain the apparent discrepancies Also, where you write "to be funded", perhaps you should write "requesting funding".

11. On the second backup slide, you have a lot of typos. E.g. "Sissor" instead of "Scissor".

Regards,
Laur

On Mon, 18 Feb 2008, Milind Diwan wrote:

[Quoted text hidden]
